

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/701,585	FUKUNAGA, TETSUYA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Maribel Medina	1754

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Maribel Medina. (3) Vince Shier.
 (2) Thomas Barnes. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 04 February 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-28.

Identification of prior art discussed: art cited ~~anti-erred in Paper #7~~.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Art Unit: 1754

Interview Summary

During the personal interview, applicant's representative showed to the Examiner a proposed Declaration, however the Examiner indicated that the declaration is not sufficient to overcome the instant prior art rejections (See paper #7). Applicants' representative, suggested to amend the independent claims to include the limitations of claims 8 and 9. Applicant's representative proposed to provide data in the form of a declaration indicating surprisingly unexpected results when using α and γ alumina as opposed to any other type of alumina as well as the ruthenium percentage composition. The Examiner agreed to consider the proposed data upon submission and indicated that further search will be required.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner Maribel Medina. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Examiner: Maribel Medina *M.M.*

Tel: 703-305-1928

Fax: 703-872-9310

December 4, 2002